

REMARKS

Claims 15-26 remain in this application. Claims 1-14 and 27-34 have been canceled. Claim 22 has been amended.

Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 and has been amended. The ambiguity regarding the baseband processor has been corrected by deleting “first” and “second” and renaming the baseband processor as “at least one baseband processor”. Accordingly, the claim is supported by both Figures 4B and 4C. The applicant notes that Figure 4C actually shows two baseband processors within a single WLAN device 108. Claim 22 is further amended to include each of the elements shown in Figures 4B and 4C.

All of the claims except claims 17 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Monin et al. (US 2002/0197984). Claims 17 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Monin without actually citing a second reference to provide a teaching for the elements introduced in claims 17 and 24 because these elements are “obvious and/or well known”. The applicant will not contest the propriety of this rejection under section 103 as Monin et al. fail teach even what is required by the independent claims.

Specifically, each of the independent claims herein require a single WLAN device to comprise a plurality of radios and plurality of baseband processor interfaces. With reference to the specific teachings cited in the official action:

Figure 2 is a diagram of a “network 22” that includes a plurality of access points 26. Thus, AP1 and AP2 are separate access points (i.e., separate WLAN devices). Thus, Figure 2 does not show multiple radios within a single access point or WLAN device. Further, the action seems to assume that Figure 2 teaches baseband processor interfaces though it does not. It shows a baseband module and a radio module, but nothing there between as, for example, is shown in Figures 4B and 4C of the present application.

The same arguments apply to claim 22. Figure 3 and its supporting text is used for the rejection of claim 22. Monin et al. state “FIG. 3 is a block diagram that schematically shows details of network 22” (first two lines of para. 74) wherein the baseband modules 40 are

“physically separate” from radio modules 42 (lines 5 and 6 of para. 74). Additionally, Figure 3 does not show the other elements of claim 22.

Neither Figure 2 nor Figure 3 of Monin et al. teach a single WLAN devices that has multiple radios and multiple baseband processor interfaces as the claims require.

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, the foregoing amendment places the Application in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn and full allowance granted. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, please contact James Harrison at (214) 902-8100.

Respectfully submitted,

GARLICK HARRISON & MARKISON

/James A. Harrison/Reg. No. 40,401

James A. Harrison

Dated: March 18, 2008

Garlick Harrison & Markison
P. O. Box 160727
Austin, TX 78716-0727
Voice: (214) 902-8100
Fax: (214) 902-8101